

Rome's Law Or Ours--- Which?

.....

Ca. W.

By THOS. E. WATSON

.....

Published and Copyrighted by
THE TOM WATSON BOOK CO., Inc.
Thomson, Georgia

1928

ROME'S LAW, OR OURS---WHICH?

ARE you willing to spend a few minutes sizing up a terribly dangerous situation, and, getting your bearings, *as an American citizen?*

There never was an oath required of a Christian minister, until hundreds of years after Christ. When the bishops of Rome began to usurp the powers of the pagan *Pontifex maximus*—in the absence of the Emperors who had removed the capitol to Constantinople—the priests who supported the Bishop's usurpations were put under oath of allegiance to him, just as feudal vassals swore allegiance to feudal lords.

Professor Pulliam of Mercer University was kind enough to translate for me the original oath prescribed for all priests at the Council of Trent (1545-63) and I ask you to carefully read it, in order that you may comprehend how absolutely and unreservedly all priests are the subjects of the Italian pope, and how the oath places Catholic laymen on the footing of subjects to the priest.

Thus, through obedience to the priests, they themselves become subjects of a foreign potentate :

PART OF "THE SACREDOTAL OATH."

(Translation from "The Holy Council of Trent.")

I declare, in like manner, that in the Mass a true, individual and propitiatory sacrifice is offered for the living and the dead, and that in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion there is truly, really and substantially the body and the blood, together with the life and divinity of our Lord, Jesus Christ; and that there is a conversion of all of the substance of the bread into the body, and of all the substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic church calls Transubstantiation. I confess, likewise, that under another form only I have received Christ, the whole and complete and the true Sacrament.

I firmly maintain that there is a Purgatory, and that souls detained there are aided by the prayers of the faithful; and, likewise that the Saints, ruling together with Christ, should be worshipped and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their Remains are to be worshipped. I most firmly declare that Images of Christ, as always of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints also, should be had and kept, and that adoration should be given them, and veneration bestowed upon them. Likewise, I affirm that the right of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them has been most salutary to the Christian people.

I recognize the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all the Churches; and I solemnly promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, who is the successor of the Blessed Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and is the Vicegerent of Jesus Christ; likewise I accept and acknowledge unhesitatingly all the other things recorded, decreed, and declared by the sacred Canons, and by the Ecumenical Councils; and at the same time I in like manner condemn, reject and anathematize whatever heresies are condemned, rejected and anathematized by the Church.

This true Catholic faith out of which no one can be saved, which in the present vow I profess

and truthfully uphold. I, in like manner, promise and vow and swear to keep and own (God helping) entire and inviolate up to the last breath of life; and that I shall see to it, so far as it shall be in my power, that it is held, taught and proclaimed by **my subjects**, or by those whose care shall appertain to me in my official service. So help me God, and this holy Evangel of God.

(Sacred Council of Trent. Padua, 1760, 800., p. 312. By permission and prerogative of the Superiors.)

On page 119, Book II. of Bishop Burnett's "History of the Reformation of the Church of England," you will find this statement:

On the 11th of May, 1532, King Henry VIII. "sent for the Speaker of the House of Commons, and told him that he found on inquiry that all the (Roman) prelates whom he had looked on as wholly his subjects, were but half-subjects: for at their consecration they swore an oath *quite contrary to the oath they swore to the Crown*; so that it seemed they were the Pope's subjects, rather than his."

The King wanted the Speaker to bring the matter to the attention of Parliament, in order that some action should be taken against this *divided* allegiance.

Bishop Burnett proceeds—

"Upon which the two oaths that the clergy swore to the King and the Pope were read in the House of Commons."

The oath of allegiance to the King was as follows:

I, A. B. do utterly testify and declare in my Conscience, that the King's Highness is the only Supreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other his Highness's Dominions and Countries,

as well in all spiritual and Ecclesiastical Things and Causes as Temporal; and that no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, preeminence of Authority Ecclesiastical or Spiritual within this Realm; And therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all Foreign Jurisdiction, Powers, Superiorities, and Authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear Faith and true Allegiance to the King's Highness, his Heirs and Lawful Successors; and to my Power shall Assist and Defend all Jurisdictions, Privileges, Preeminences and Authorities, Granted or belonging to the King's Highness, his Heirs and Successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. So help me God, and by the Contents of this Book.

The oath which all Catholic prelates took, *for the Pope*, contains the most sweeping submission to his authority, the obligation to maintain him in all his claims of power, and the vow to obey all Rules, Decrees, Ordinances, Sentences, Dispositions, Reservations and Provisions issuing from Rome. Then follow these words:

“Heretics, schismatics, and Rebels to our Holy Father and his Successors, I shall resist and *persecute*.”

In a marginal note, Bishop Burnett states that the actual words in the Latin oath are, “*Prosequar in pugnabo*.”

(The word *pugnabo* implies physical *forcé*, *violence*, *battle*. Our words *pugnacious*, *pugnacity*, and *punitive* belong to the same class.)

In consequence of King Henry's discovery of the divided allegiance of Roman Catholics, he caused Parliament to enact severe laws,

which required Englishmen to swear that the King of England was *Supreme* within the realm.

Catholics had to make oath that they owed no allegiance, temporal or spiritual, to any foreign prince, power or potentate.

(The State of New York copied that law, and used to enforce it upon Roman Catholic immigrants, before our War Between the States.)

Many English Catholics refused to take the oath of "Supremacy"—as it was called—and they were put to death as traitors.

Sir Thomas More, the Chancellor, who had barbarously burnt fellow-Christians for denying that priests could create God out of wine and bread, was himself beheaded because he refused to take the oath of undivided allegiance to King Henry.

To meet another clause of the treasonous oath of the priests, it was made a capital offense to introduce into England any papal order, decree, excommunication, or other provision, without the consent of the King.

Had Gibbons, O'Connell, and Farley lived in Great Britain, a few generations ago, they would have been put to death, *for treason*, on account of the infamous *Ne temere* decree which they brought into this country in 1908.

Had they gone to Rome, taken that treasonous oath of blind obedience to the Italian pope,

and returned to England, Queen Elizabeth, or King Edward VI. would have had their heads cut off.

Lord Baltimore sneaked out of England under King James I., rather than take the oath of undivided allegiance, and the Catholics whom he settled in Maryland did the same thing.

They were not willing to swear, that the Pope had no right to overthrow Protestant governments, subvert Protestant laws, and *persecute to death* such heretics as you and I.

Right now, if a real oath of allegiance were offered to either of these three Irish Cardinals, or to Archbishop Blenk, or to Bishop Keiley, he would refuse to take it.

He couldn't take it, without perjuring himself, although he might do so with "a mental reservation."

The Pope's is the only church that is foreign; the only church whose laws antagonize democracy and republican institutions; the only church that sends and receives ambassadors; the only church that has a secret cipher, a secret service and a world-wide network of secret societies; the only church whose theology teaches murder, and whose literature is so obscene that she savagely prosecutes ex-monas, ex-nuns, ex-priests, and Protestants who expose it.

The Pope's is the only church which organizes for political purposes, and calls upon

her members to so use their votes as to change our laws into conformity with hers.

The Pope's law condemns freedom of the press and of speech; and Catholics now are bending every energy to put the Pope's law in place of ours.

Liberty of worship would go next, and then the schools would fall completely into the power of Rome.

In essentials, we would be the subjects of a foreigner, just as we were in the days of King George, only the oppression would be infinitely worse.

If these Irish Cardinals could *Mexicanize* us, they would.

If we don't wake up and get busy, *they will*.

For 400 years, the Roman prelates had full control of Mexico, one of the richest lands on the globe; and see what they did for it!

They enslaved the people, robbed them of their produce, kept them in ignorance, filled them with degrading superstitions, vilely misused their women; and built gorgeous Cathedrals and palaces for themselves, leaving the miserable peon to live in a wretched hut, hardly fit for a decent man's dog.

That's what they did in Cuba and South America; what they did in the Philippines; what they did in Italy itself, until Garibaldi, Cavour and Victor Emmanuel broke the papal yoke.

Portugal was sunk to the lowest depths by the same detestable system, and only suc-

ceeded in throwing it off six or eight years ago.

But our daily papers and many Protestant preachers are mysteriously convinced, that the Roman system is not the same that it was in Italy, in 1848; in Portugal, in 1908; in the Philippines, in 1898; in Mexico, in 1895.

In Mexico, the Catholic priests were *burning* heretics in 1895; in Rome, they were starving and assassinating them, in 1848; in Portugal, the nuns and their babies left the convents together, in 1908; and in the Philippines, the Taft Commission uncovered a situation as hideous as the darkest days of medievalism.

But it can't come to us, they say!

CAN'T IT?

In the very Convention that heard so much loyalty to American institutions the professions were belied by the speakers themselves.

They demand control of our national policy toward Mexico.

They crave another 400 years of peonage, of unrestricted vice, of unrelieved ignorance, and of profligate living for immoral priests.

They demand that the Pope's law of Divorce drive ours off the Statute book.

They crave complete ownership of the wife and child, in order that American mothers may be abject slaves, as European women used to be, when Popes were supreme.

They demand that the U. S. mails be closed

to all such Protestant literature as dares to tell the truth on Rome's infernal foreign system.

Popery never was *accepted* by any nation. It has always been an organization of brute force.

Christianity had won Italy, long before the sons of Constantine, and Theodosius *forced* Popery upon the churches.

Charlemagne *forced* popery upon the Saxons, just as Henry II. of England forced it upon the independent Christians in Ireland.

Without exception, every nation that yielded to the yoke of Rome, *was made to do it, by the ruthless employment of military force.*

In England, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, Central America, South America, Germany, Austria, Bohemia and Italy, the story has ever been the same.

No nation voluntarily accepted Popery; and wherever the Papacy has conquered, it was a tale of blood, of carnage, of pitiless crime.

The very law of popery makes it a criminal, against God and man.

The very law of the Roman church makes it a church of persecution, of oppression, of **MURDER!**

Its very law is against Light, Progress, mental integrity, and independent Thought.

Its very purpose is to enslave, to dominate, to pillage, to debase, to rule the very

minds of men, women and children, from the cradle to the grave; and to dupe, mistreat, and plunder them, at every stage of the journey.

It is a marvelous circumstance, that editors and preachers will take the irresponsible word of American priests, when everybody can read the law itself, as laid down by the Popes, and codified by Vatican officials.

That foreign code is horrible, and it means war with ours.

Gladstone warned England; and now England sees how popish treason hampers her in Canada and Ireland.

Gambetta warned France; and France heeded the warning, thereby securing a unity which England lacks in the crisis of her fate.

Bismarck warned the Germans, and he drove the Jesuits out; but William II. let them return, and they have been conspiring for a general war, ever since.

Is there no need of a warning to our people?

In the New York Convention, these Jesuits actually declared, *that our Government should use its influence to have the Pope created arbiter of the Peace Conference when the war is over.*

Why not have the Methodist church represented?

Why not demand that the Baptists have a representative?

Why not place in the Peace Conference for the Arch-bishop of Canterbury.

The Turks saved Austria and Germany: why not demand representation for the Sheik ul Islam?

Mahomet was much nearer Christianity than most of the Popes have been.

The present pope is a Jesuit, *and no Christian could possibly subscribe to the Jesuit oath.*

The Jesuits had a famous law case in France, growing out of Jesuit mercantile transactions on the Island of Martinique, West Indies.

These Jesuits were so powerful, that they believed themselves above the law, and they became piratical with their ships. Their refusal to pay an honest debt to the Lioncy Brothers and Gouffre forced the Marseilles merchants into bankruptcy; but litigation ensued, and the High Court at Paris forced the Jesuit Society to produce secret books.

“Father” Lavalette was the name of the defendant, and the consequence of his exposure was that *this criminal secret society was expelled.*

The bloody clause in its oath is that which swears them to *extirpate* heretics and heresies.

The oath also contains the orthodox Catholic dogma, that the Pope has the power to depose non-Catholic rulers, and to destroy non-Catholic governments.

According to the affidavit of the Rev. P. A. Seguin, and the editorial statement of

Bishop Manuel Ferrando, the oath of the priest is fully as treasonous and murderous as that of the Jesuits.

There is no doubt whatever that the 4th Degree Knights of Columbus and the Ancient Order of Hibernians take a similar oath.

In Ireland, it has been proved in Court on the Hibernians, time and again; and Father McDermott accuses them of the Molly McGuire murders in Pennsylvania.

Now reflect what all this tends to, *inevitably*:

Three Irish cardinals sworn to persecute their fellow citizens;

Bishops and Arch-bishops sworn to the same thing;

Twenty thousand priests sworn to persecute; and Jesuits flocking here from all parts of the world, sworn to *extirpate* non-Catholics.

Are the oaths meaningless?

If so, why do they sign them?

Those oaths led to civil war in Ireland, England, and Scotland.

Those oaths drenched Italy in blood, blasted Protestantism in Bohemia, and cursed Germany with a Thirty Years' War.

Those oaths brought a French army upon Mexico in 1864, and caused the Armageddon now raging.

The Pope is a Jesuit—and the private secretary of President Wilson is not only a lay-Jesuit, but a 4th Degree Knight of Columbus.

The three Irish cardinals are Jesuits, *sworn to persecute and TO EXTIRPATE*, if they took the usual Jesuit oath.

Fourth Degree Knights of Columbus hold the most powerful governmental appointments.

Systematically, they are driving non-Catholics out of the public service.

The head of the Army on the Mexican border is O'Ryan, an Irish Catholic, and I presume a 4th Degree Knight of Columbus.

Knights of Columbus in Congress are striving to close the mails to anti-Catholic literature.

In the New York Convention, orders were issued for all Catholic young men to form rifle clubs, *of their own*.

None but Catholics can join these rifle clubs; and as the K. of C. and the German Central Verein are already armed and drilled, the Pope will have *three* standing armies in this Republic ready to obey the three Irish cardinals who are the sworn enemies of their non-Catholic fellow citizens, and the sworn subjects of a *foreign church whose law calls for heretic BLOOD*.

Separate Popish colonies aloof from Americans: separate schools where un-American principles are taught: separate secret societies which none but Catholics can join: separate rifle clubs whose guns are for Catholics only: a separate code of laws, irreconcilable to ours: *to what* does all this tend, if not to Civil War?

The English historian, Froude, says, in his "Short Studies of Great Subjects":

In countries governed by authority, intelligence rules. In free countries, numbers rule. The supremacy of the Church is incompatible with any kind of liberty—liberty of conscience or of reason, liberty for man to expand in any direction save what the church marks out for him.

Obviously and confessedly, it is enemy of everything which we now call civilization and improvement. Yet it is an enemy against which self-governed peoples, who are most proud of their supposed advancement, contend at greatest disadvantages. Power follows the majority of votes. The Church marshals its forces in an unbroken phalanx. The theory of a free government supposes every citizen to be influenced by patriotism, to exert his own intelligence, to take a personal and individual share in the business of the State. The Roman Catholics have no country but their church. They are allowed no independence. They are private soldiers in an army which is commanded by the priests, and united and organized action is as superior at the polling-booth as an army is superior to a mob in the field. They claim their right to the free assertion of their opinions in the name of republican principles, and it cannot be denied them. But no such republican liberty is permitted within their own lines. They obey their commanders, and their commanders care nothing for the nation in the management of which they are challenging a share. They are members of a spiritual empire which aims only at submitting all other powers under the feet. They are Catholics first, and Americans or English afterwards. Yet as English or American citizens, they possess the privileges of freemen, and the wire-pullers at political elections, whose horizon is bounded by the result of some immediate struggle, know too well the value of such allies to be unwilling to bid high for their support. Thus it is that in the English Parliament, though England does not herself return a single Catholic representative, the Catholics, through the Irish members, often

hold the balance of power, and governments exist but by their sufferance.

(Short Studies, Etc. page 106.)

ROME'S CRIMINAL SECRET SOCIETIES.

What will be the natural fruits of those Romanist secret societies, armed, drilled, and sworn to murder?

If the oaths mean nothing, why are they prescribed, and why do Catholics swear to obey them?

In the book whose title is "Pope, or President" I find the following, which is in substance the same as the oath of the Jusuists, the Sinn Fein, the Ancient Order Hibernians, the 4th Degree Knights of Columbus, and the Clan-na-Gael: the oath given below being that of the Italian papal secret order, called the San Fidesti, organized under Pope Pius IX:

"I, N. N., in presence of Almighty God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, of the ever immaculate Virgin Mary, and of all the celestial court, etc.; of you, honored father, swear, that I will sooner cut off my right hand, and die of hunger, or under the greatest torments; and I pray the Lord God Almighty to condemn me to the endless pains of hell, than to betray or deceive one of the honored fathers and brethren of the Catholic Apostolical Society to which I subscribed at this time, or if I do not scrupulously fulfill its laws, or give assistance to my brethren in want. I swear to defend myself in the cause which I have embraced, never to spare a single individual belonging to the infamous combination of the Liberals, whatever may be his birth, parentage, or fortune, and to have no pity for the cries of children, nor of old men or women, and to shed the blood of the infamous Liberals, even to the last drop, without regard to age, sex, or rank. Finally, I swear implacable hatred to all the enemies of our Holy Roman Catholic religion, one and true."

